1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 7 CATHERINE O'KEEFE, CASE NO. C22-1111-KKE 8 Plaintiff(s), MINUTE ORDER 9 v. 10 HOLLAND AMERICA LINE INC., et al., 11 Defendant(s). 12 The following Minute Order is made by direction of the Court, the Honorable Kymberly 13 K. Evanson, United States District Judge: 14 Oral argument on the pending motions in this case has been scheduled for November 28, 15 2023. See Dkt. No. 49. The Court directs counsel to come to that hearing prepared to discuss, 16 *inter alia*, the following issues: 17 (1) Defendants urge the Court to avoid addressing the choice-of-law issue raised by 18 Plaintiff. See Dkt. No. 34 at 9-10. What authority supports Defendants' position that 19 Plaintiff should raise the choice-of-law argument to the arbitrator rather than the Court? 20 (2) Defendants assume the "relevant time" for purposes of determining Plaintiff's country 21 of citizenship is sometime before November 22, 2022. See Dkt. No. 34 at n.1. When 22 does each party believe Plaintiff's country of citizenship should be determined, and 23 what authority supports that position? 24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

(3) Is either party aware of authority that would allow the Court to compel arbitration but modify the location of the arbitration and/or the applicable law? Or must the arbitration provision be either enforced in its entirety or declared null and void? The Court is aware that defendant cruise ships have, on other occasions, offered to stipulate to arbitration in the United States and/or to the application of United States law. *See, e.g., Yuzwa v. M/V OOSTERDAM*, No. 12-2663, 2012 WL 6675171, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 17, 2012); *Javier v. Carnival Corp.*, No. 09-2003, 2010 WL 3633173, at *9 (S.D. Cal. Sep. 13, 2010). Are these cases instructive here, in the absence of such a stipulation? Dated this 21st day of November 2023.

Ravi Subramanian

Clerk

/s/ Serge Bodnarchuk
Deputy Clerk